

### **Remarks**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1 through 21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 12 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from Claims 1, 9 and 12. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19 and 20. Applicants have added new claim 21. Applicants have cancelled claim 6.

#### **Rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-4, 8-14 and 17-20 have been rejected for lack of antecedent basis for recited limitations in the claims. Applicants have amended the claims to provide antecedent basis for each of the recited limitations in the claims.

#### **Rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 11-12, 14, 16-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0141605) in view of Elliott et al. (U. S. Patent 6,754,181). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertions.

Claims 2, 4-6, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0141605) in view of Elliott et al. (U. S. Patent 6,754,181) and further in view of Wu (U. S. Patent 6,275,575). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertions.

Claims 9-10 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0141605) in view of Elliott et al. (U. S. Patent 6,754,181) and further in view of Malik (U. S. Patent 6,801,610). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertions.

Applicants state that a primary objective is to provides a teleconferencing method and system in which that places the contact responsibility on the conference host, rather than passively requiring individuals to connect to the conference (see Abstract and Figure 4). To that end claim 1 contains the step of initiating a connection attempt with each

participant at the host instead of the host passively waiting for participants to call as is the convention process for teleconferences.

With regard to Chen, the examiner cites paragraphs [0016] and [0019] in Chen as describing this initiating step. Paragraph [0016] of Chen describes an objective of providing a method and system that will allow participants to call into a telephone conference meeting without interrupting the meeting. This process focuses on calling into a meeting after the meeting has already begun. Further, this process has the activity placed on the participant, which is what the present invention wants to change. Chen describes techniques that teach away from Applicants' present invention. Paragraph [0019] of Chen relates to generating reports. Neither Elliot, Wu, nor Malik address the matter of having the host initiate the connection process when it is time to begin a teleconference meeting.

In order to sustain prima facie obviousness, there must be some teaching or suggestion to modify or combine cited references. Applicant's submit that first none of the cited references teaches or suggest the recited 'initiating a connection attempt' as described in Applicants' invention. If no reference mentions or described this step, there is no motivation to combine the references to produce Applicants' invention. If there is no teaching, there is no prima facie case for obviousness. Applicants further submit that a combining of the cited references will not produce Applicants' present invention.

With regard to the step of monitoring activities, the present invention has a monitoring process that can respond to detected events and initiate action based on the detected events. This process is accomplished in addition to the monitoring and recording activities.

Examiner further asserts that the automatic reports generated in the Applicants' present invention are extremely old and well known. Section 707.05(2) of the MPEP states that when a rejection is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be specific as possible and the reference must be supported when called for by the Applicant. In accordance with Section 707.05(2) of the MPEP, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner support this assertion that the

automatic reports generated in the Applicants' present invention are extremely old and well-known in the art.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the art of record (alone or in combination) teaches, discloses or even suggests the invention as recited in each of Applicant's claims. Applicant further submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and passage to issuance is respectfully requested. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Applicants have added one new independent claim. However, the original application contained only two independent claims. In addition, Applicants have canceled one claim. In both actions, Applicants have not exceeded claim limits. There Applicants submit that no new fees are due as the result of amendments to the claims. Applicant has submitted with this response a petition for one-month extension. The fee for this extension is submitted with this reply. Please apply these charges or any credits, to Deposit Account 09-4447 (Reference Number ASU920030617US1).

Respectfully Submitted,



Darcell Walker  
Reg. No. 34,945  
9301 Southwest Freeway, Suite 250  
Houston, Texas 77074  
713-772-1255  
October 7, 2005